

Charging effects in quantum wires

Reinhold Egger and Hermann Grabert

Fakultät für Physik, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Hermann-Herder-Straße 3, D-79104 Freiburg, Germany
(to be published in Phys. Rev. B)

We investigate the role of charging effects in a voltage-biased quantum wire. Both the finite range of the Coulomb interaction and the long-ranged nature of the Friedel oscillation imply a finite capacitance, leading to a charging energy. While observable Coulomb blockade effects are absent for a single impurity, they are crucial if islands are present. For a double barrier, we give the resonance condition, fully taking into account the charging of the island.

PACS numbers: 72.10.-d, 73.40.Gk

I. INTRODUCTION

One-dimensional (1D) quantum wires have attracted much interest lately due to theoretical developments and advanced fabrication techniques. By using a special split-gate technology¹ or cleaved-edge overgrowth,² high-quality 1D channels in GaAs-AlGaAs heterostructures have recently been fabricated. The typical mean free path can be of the order of $10\mu\text{m}$, which brings one close to the possibility of experimentally probing the transport properties of quantum wires, with either none or only very few impurities. The most prominent transport quantity, the conductance, has been theoretically studied in great detail, especially for the clean case^{3,4} or for a single impurity.⁴⁻⁷ However, little effort has been undertaken so far to reveal the nature of charging effects⁸ in a quantum wire. In this paper, we discuss charging effects for the simplest case of a spinless single-channel wire.

The importance of charging effects is established by the magnitude of the charging energy e^2/C . To calculate this quantity, we utilize standard bosonization methods⁹⁻¹¹ in conjunction with our recently developed boundary condition approach.⁴ This formalism allows for a particularly simple derivation of the capacitance C of a single impurity in the limit of strong impurity backscattering strength. It is intuitively clear that the capacitance will to a large degree depend on the interaction range R of the Coulomb potential in the quantum wire.¹² Therefore, to describe charging effects for realistic experimental setups characterized by a finite R , we go beyond the strict Luttinger liquid picture¹¹ which has zero range, $R = 0$, and consider an arbitrary screened Coulomb interaction potential $U(x - y)$. It turns out that (at least concerning dc properties) charging effects will only be present if the quantum wire contains islands formed by two impurities. Including the charging contribution, we provide the resonance condition for resonant tunneling through a double barrier structure. Due to the finite charging energy, we find a different resonance condition than the one predicted^{5,13} for resonant tunneling in a Luttinger liquid.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Sec. II, the boundary condition approach is applied to the case of a quantum wire with arbitrary Coulomb interactions containing a single impurity. This formalism is used in Sec. III to compute the charge screening cloud around a strong impurity, from which one can define the capacitance C . The resonance condition for resonant tunneling through a double barrier is derived in Sec. IV, and the additional charging contribution is discussed in detail. Finally, some conclusions are offered in Sec. V.

II. BOUNDARY CONDITION FORMALISM

We employ the standard bosonization method,⁹⁻¹¹ which holds in the low-energy regime where only plasmons are well-defined eigenmodes. The electron creation operator can then be written in terms of plasmon displacement fields $\theta(x)$ and $\phi(x)$,

$$\psi^\dagger(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\omega_c}{2\pi v_F}} \sum_{p=\pm} \exp\{ipk_F x + i\sqrt{\pi}[p\theta(x) + \phi(x)]\}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\omega_c = v_F k_F$ is the bandwidth (we put $\hbar = 1$), and the sum goes over left- and right-moving pieces ($p = \pm$). These fields obey the algebra

$$[\phi(x), \theta(y)] = -(i/2)\text{sgn}(x - y),$$

such that $\Pi = \partial_x \phi$ constitutes the canonical momentum for the θ field. The non-interacting 1D electron gas is then described by the bosonized form of the massless Dirac Hamiltonian

$$H_0 = \frac{v_F}{2} \int dx [\Pi^2(x) + (\partial_x \theta(x))^2]. \quad (2.2)$$

Arbitrary screened Coulomb interactions can be included as follows. From Eq. (2.1), the boson representation of the density operator is

$$\rho(x) = \frac{k_F}{\pi} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \partial_x \theta(x) + \frac{k_F}{\pi} \cos[2k_F x + 2\sqrt{\pi}\theta(x)]. \quad (2.3)$$

The $2k_F$ -oscillatory component comes from interference of right- and left-movers and is responsible for a Friedel oscillation¹⁴ in a system with broken translational invariance. In the standard expression for the electron-electron interaction,

$$H_I = \frac{1}{2} \int dx dy \rho(x) U(x-y) \rho(y), \quad (2.4)$$

the interaction among the $2k_F$ parts of $\rho(x)$ and $\rho(y)$ gives rise to electron-electron backscattering.¹⁰ In the following, we assume that the screened interaction

$$U(x-y) = \int \frac{dk}{2\pi} U_k \exp[ik(x-y)]$$

is sufficiently long-ranged such that U_{2k_F} is small. In that case, backscattering can be neglected. This is of course not an essential assumption but simplifies notation in the following. In a homogeneous wire, the interaction between the slow and the $2k_F$ part of ρ averages out due to a rapidly oscillating phase factor, i.e., due to momentum conservation. We then take into account only the forward scattering contribution,

$$H_I = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int dx dy \partial_x \theta(x) U(x-y) \partial_y \theta(y).$$

This is the interaction between the slow components in Eq. (2.3).

Next we discuss how to incorporate coupling of the quantum wire to external reservoirs. Incidentally, it has become quite customary to use non-interacting 1D Luttinger liquids described by Eq. (2.2) as a model for the external leads.^{3,15} There is a serious shortcoming inherent to such a modelling. If one connects the interacting wire to 1D non-interacting leads, one effectively has an inhomogeneous interaction potential $U(x, y)$. In that case, the Coulomb interaction between the slow and the $2k_F$ parts of ρ does *not* necessarily average to zero since momentum is not conserved anymore. In fact, if the interactions are switched off on a lengthscale $1/k_F$, we obtain from Eq. (2.4) effective potential scatterers at the boundaries of the wire of large backscattering strength,

$$V_{\text{eff}} \simeq \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - 1 \right) \omega_c.$$

Hence, from a microscopic point of view, transport would practically be suppressed with such leads. This additional interaction term has been disregarded in Refs. 3,15, but it is present in a quantum wire connected to 1D non-interacting leads.

These difficulties are avoided by the boundary condition approach of Ref. 4. The reservoirs inject currents at both ends of the wire. In the spirit of Landauer's approach for non-interacting systems,¹⁶ the injection of currents can be described by Sommerfeld-type radiation conditions. Coupling to external reservoirs held at a chemical potential difference $\Delta\mu = eU_{\text{ex}}$ leads to the boundary conditions

$$\left(\pm \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{v_F} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \langle \theta(x \rightarrow \mp \infty, t) \rangle = eU_{\text{ex}}/2\sqrt{\pi}v_F. \quad (2.5)$$

These conditions have to be imposed at both ends of the quantum wire, i.e., far away from all impurities but still inside the quantum wire such that bosonization is meaningful, and for all times t . In general, the effects of an applied voltage cannot be captured by adding new terms to the Hamiltonian. The boundary condition approach holds for arbitrary Coulomb interaction potentials and allows for arbitrary arrangements of impurities inside the quantum wire. Since we are not directly concerned with conductance calculations in the following, we use for simplicity the $T = 0$ imaginary-time formalism, where the equivalent conditions

$$\left(\pm \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{i}{v_F} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \right) \langle \theta(x \rightarrow \mp \infty, \tau = 0) \rangle = eU_{\text{ex}}/2\sqrt{\pi}v_F \quad (2.6)$$

are imposed. Here we have picked the time $\tau = 0$ by convention.

We first discuss the case of a single impurity located at $x = 0$, and consider the generating functional

$$Z(x_0, s) = \langle \exp[2\sqrt{\pi}is\theta(x_0, \tau = 0)] \rangle.$$

One can formally solve for Z by using the auxiliary field $q(\tau) = 2\sqrt{\pi}\theta(0, \tau)$, where the constraint is enforced by a Lagrange multiplier field $\Lambda(\tau)$. The resulting effective action is

$$\begin{aligned} S_e[\theta, \Lambda, q] = & \frac{v_F}{2} \int d\tau dx \left[\frac{1}{v_F^2} (\partial_\tau \theta)^2 + (\partial_x \theta)^2 \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\tau dx dy \partial_x \theta(x) U(x-y) \partial_y \theta(y) \\ & + V \int d\tau \cos[q(\tau)] - 2\sqrt{\pi}is\theta(x_0, 0) \\ & + i \int d\tau \Lambda(\tau) [2\sqrt{\pi}\theta(0, \tau) - q(\tau)], \end{aligned}$$

where V denotes the impurity backscattering strength. The action is now quadratic in the θ part, which therefore can be integrated out by solving the classical Euler-Lagrange equation. This has to be done under the boundary condition (2.6).

Analogous to the zero-range Luttinger liquid case treated in Ref. 4, this can be achieved by decomposing fields into homogeneous and particular parts, $\theta = \theta_h + \theta_p$ and $\Lambda = \Lambda_h + \Lambda_p$. The particular solution θ_p has to fulfill Eq. (2.6) and the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{v_F^2} \partial_\tau^2 \theta_p(x, \tau) + \partial_x^2 \theta_p(x, \tau) \\ & + \int dy \frac{U(x-y)}{\pi v_F} \partial_y^2 \theta_p(y, \tau) = (2\sqrt{\pi}i/v_F) \Lambda_p(\tau) \delta(x). \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

A solution subject to Eq. (2.6) requires a τ -independent Λ_p . We make the ansatz

$$\theta_p(x, \tau) = -\frac{e\bar{\varphi}}{2\sqrt{\pi}v_F}|x| - i\tau\frac{e(U_{\text{ex}} - \bar{\varphi})}{2\sqrt{\pi}} + f(x) - f(0), \quad (2.8)$$

where $\partial_x f(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ for the τ -independent function $f(x)$.

Switching to Fourier space, one finds from Eqs. (2.7) and (2.8)

$$-\frac{e\bar{\varphi}}{\sqrt{\pi}v_F}(1 + U_k/\pi v_F) - k^2(1 + U_k/\pi v_F)f_k \quad (2.9)$$

$$= (2\sqrt{\pi}i/v_F)\Lambda_p.$$

The $k = 0$ component of Eq. (2.9) determines the quantity $\bar{\varphi}$ in terms of the zero mode Λ_p of the Lagrange multiplier,

$$\Lambda_p = \frac{ie\bar{\varphi}}{2\pi g^2}.$$

Here we have introduced the usual dimensionless Luttinger liquid parameter g as a measure of the forward scattering interaction strength,^{5,9–11}

$$1/g^2 = 1 + U_0/\pi v_F.$$

The non-interacting limit is $g = 1$, and for repulsive interactions, one has $g < 1$. Naturally, a screened interaction is characterized by g and the range R (and possibly by other parameters). For $R = 0$, the $k \neq 0$ components of Eq. (2.9) vanish identically, and $f(x)$ stays constant. In the general finite-range case, we have from Eq. (2.9) the simple result

$$f_k = \frac{e\bar{\varphi}(U_0 - U_k)}{\pi^{3/2}\omega_k^2}, \quad (2.10)$$

which apparently vanishes for the zero-range case where $U_k = U_0$ for all k . Here, the plasmon frequency is

$$\omega_k = v_F|k|\sqrt{1 + U_k/\pi v_F}. \quad (2.11)$$

The homogeneous solution (for $U_{\text{ex}} = 0$ boundary condition) is easily expressed in terms of the boson propagators

$$F(x, \omega) = v_F \int dk \frac{\exp(ikx)}{\omega^2 + \omega_k^2}, \quad (2.12)$$

such that

$$\theta_h(x, \tau) = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{i\omega\tau} [\Lambda_h(\omega)F(x, \omega) - sF(x - x_0, \omega)].$$

Inserting $\theta_h + \theta_p$ back into the action, one observes that Λ_h appears only in quadratic form and can therefore be

integrated out immediately. After some algebra, one finally arrives at

$$Z(x, s) = W(x)^{s^2} \left\langle e^{2\sqrt{\pi}is\theta_p(x, 0)} \exp \left[is \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} q(\omega) \frac{F(x, \omega)}{F(0, \omega)} \right] \right\rangle. \quad (2.13)$$

The envelope function $W(x)$ is given by

$$W(x) = \exp \left[\int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \frac{F^2(x, \omega) - F^2(0, \omega)}{F(0, \omega)} \right], \quad (2.14)$$

and the average over $q(\omega) = (2\pi)^{-1} \int d\omega q(\tau) \exp(i\omega\tau)$ has to be carried out using the action

$$S = \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \frac{q(\omega)q(-\omega)}{4F(0, \omega)} + \frac{e\bar{\varphi}}{2\pi g^2} \int d\tau q(\tau)$$

$$+ V \int d\tau \cos[q(\tau) - ie(U_{\text{ex}} - \bar{\varphi})\tau].$$

In principle, $\bar{\varphi}$ is a fluctuating quantity: One has to average over it, because it is the zero-mode of the Lagrange multiplier field. Its physical meaning is the four-terminal voltage.⁴ In the case of strong impurities considered here, $\bar{\varphi}$ is therefore just equal to the two-terminal voltage U_{ex} . In the following, we restrict ourselves to the strong-impurity limit where charging effects are most pronounced, and put $\bar{\varphi} = U_{\text{ex}}$.

III. IMPURITY SCREENING PROFILE AND CAPACITANCE

Let us now analyze the expectation value of the slow component of the density, $\rho_0(x) = \langle \partial_x \theta \rangle / \sqrt{\pi}$. It can be obtained by suitable differentiation of the generating functional (2.13), with the result $\rho_0(x) = \partial_x \theta_p(x, 0) / \sqrt{\pi}$, since the contributions from the homogeneous solution cancel out.¹⁷ Therefore, Eq. (2.8) yields

$$\rho_0(x) = -\frac{eU_{\text{ex}}}{2\pi v_F} \text{sgn}(x) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \partial_x f(x). \quad (3.1)$$

The Fourier transform of $f(x)$ is given in Eq. (2.10). The uniform contribution $\sim \text{sgn}(x)$ is due to charging of the large shunt capacitances between the quantum wire and the metallic (screening and confining) gates, and the corresponding charge on the impurity, $Q_s = Le^2 U_{\text{ex}} / 4\pi v_F$, scales with the total length L of the wire. The observation of dc charging effects for a single impurity is rendered impossible by this macroscopically large charge.⁴ This can also be shown by computing the current-voltage characteristics.¹⁸

The remaining part in Eq. (3.1) can now be employed to provide a microscopic definition of the *capacitance* C of a strong impurity in a quantum wire. Since $f(x \rightarrow \pm\infty) = 0$, we have with $Q = -e \int_0^\infty dx [\rho(x) - \rho(-x)]/2$

the simple result $C_{\text{fr}} = Q/U_{\text{ex}} = ef(0)/\sqrt{\pi}U_{\text{ex}}$, or explicitly

$$C_{\text{fr}} = (e/\pi)^2 \int \frac{dk}{2\pi} \frac{U_0 - U_k}{\omega_k^2}. \quad (3.2)$$

There is also a contribution C_{2k_F} due to the Friedel oscillation, i.e., the $2k_F$ component of ρ in Eq. (2.3). While the finite-range capacitance C_{fr} vanishes for the usual zero-range Luttinger liquid, C_{2k_F} is finite even for $R = 0$ unless one is in the non-interacting limit $g = 1$. The result for C_{2k_F} can be found in Ref. 4. In total, since the charges simply add up, the capacitance is then given by $C = C_{\text{fr}} + C_{2k_F}$. For the rather long-ranged interactions typically present in quantum wires, $k_F R \gg 1$, the slow component will dominate, $C_{\text{fr}} \gg C_{2k_F}$.

To give a concrete example, we consider the particularly simple form of an exponential interaction with dimensionless forward scattering strength $u = U_0/\pi v_F$ such that $g = 1/\sqrt{1+u}$,

$$U(x-y) = \frac{\pi v_F u}{2R} \exp(-|x-y|/R), \quad U_k = \frac{\pi v_F u}{1 + (Rk)^2}, \quad (3.3)$$

which allows for explicit analytical calculations. The full density profile is found from Eqs. (2.10) and (3.1),

$$\rho_0(x) = -\frac{eU_{\text{ex}}}{2\pi v_F} \text{sgn}(x)[1 + ue^{-|x|/gR}],$$

such that the impurity charge at $x = 0$ is exponentially screened on a scale gR . The finite-range capacitance is easily found from Eq. (3.2) as

$$C_{\text{fr}} = \frac{e^2 u R}{2\pi v_F \sqrt{1+u}}. \quad (3.4)$$

Interestingly, the capacitance is proportional to the interaction range, $C_{\text{fr}} \sim R$. This behavior follows immediately from simple dimensional scaling if the Coulomb interaction depends only on $|x-y|/R$. Furthermore, C_{fr} increases monotonously (but not linearly) with Coulomb interaction strength u .

From Eqs. (2.11) and (2.12), one can also evaluate the boson propagators in closed form for the interaction (3.3). The lengthy result can be simplified in two important limits. For $|\omega| \ll v_F/R$, the Luttinger liquid result

$$F(x, \omega) = \frac{g\pi}{|\omega|} \exp[-|g\omega x/v_F|] \quad (3.5)$$

is recovered. On the other hand, for $|\omega| \gg v_F/R$, one finds the non-interacting result, i.e., Eq. (3.5) with $g = 1$. Apparently there is a new energy scale v_F/R associated with the interaction range. For frequencies small compared to this scale, the electrons basically see a zero-range (Luttinger liquid) interaction, while for frequencies larger than v_F/R , the non-interacting behavior is found.

In that case the electrons are too fast to see each other via the finite-range Coulomb interaction.

The Friedel oscillation can be evaluated from Eq. (2.14), since $W(x)$ directly determines the $U_{\text{ex}} = 0$ Friedel oscillation for a strong scatterer,¹⁹

$$\langle \rho_{2k_F}(x) \rangle = -(k_F/\pi)W(x) \sin[2k_F x].$$

Splitting up the frequency integration in Eq. (2.14) into $|\omega| < v_F/R$ and $|\omega| > v_F/R$, and using the respective boson propagators, one finds that approximately

$$W(x) \simeq (1 + 2gx/R)^{-g} \frac{2k_F x}{1 + 2x/R}.$$

For $x \gg R$, this reproduces the Luttinger liquid result, namely an algebraic decay of the Friedel oscillation $\sim x^{-g}$. On the other hand, there is a crossover to the faster non-interacting law for $x \ll R$, where the Friedel oscillation decays as $1/x$. We note that for a weak impurity, the situation is more complex since there is a competing influence trying to slow down the Friedel oscillation close to the impurity.¹⁴

A similar behavior characterizes the conductance. The Luttinger liquid power laws⁵⁻⁷ are observed only on energy scales small compared to v_F/R , while one has the non-interacting behavior for larger energy scales.

Finally, let us comment on the case of an unscreened interaction of the form²⁰

$$U(x-y) = \frac{e^2}{\kappa \sqrt{(x-y)^2 + d^2}}, \quad U_k = -\frac{2e^2}{\kappa} \ln[kd]. \quad (3.6)$$

Here, κ is the dielectric constant and d denotes the width of the wire ($kd \ll 1$). The capacitance can be obtained from Eq. (3.2). Since the interactions are strong, Eq. (3.2) can be simplified to

$$C_{\text{fr}} = -\frac{e^2}{\pi^2 v_F} \int_{1/R}^{1/d} \frac{dk}{k^2} \left(1 + \frac{\ln[R/d]}{\ln[kd]} \right),$$

where a finite interaction range R allows for a controlled evaluation of C_{fr} . The integration yields

$$C_{\text{fr}} = \frac{e^2}{\pi^2 v_F} \frac{R}{\ln[R/d]} + \mathcal{O}(R/\ln^2[R/d]). \quad (3.7)$$

Therefore C_{fr} diverges $\sim R/\ln R$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$ for an unscreened Coulomb interaction. This underlines the crucial importance of charging effects in quantum wires with a long-ranged $1/|x-y|$ Coulomb potential.²¹ It is noteworthy that due to the $R/\ln R$ dependence of the capacitance (3.7), the charge Q_s disappears in the unscreened case: The interaction range R becomes larger than the length of the quantum wire only in the absence of screening gates.

IV. DOUBLE BARRIER

The capacitance C and hence Coulomb blockade effects can be experimentally observed once islands are present in the quantum wire. The simplest case is given by a double barrier.^{5,13,22} We consider two strong impurities located at $x = \pm d/2$, take an infinitesimal two-terminal voltage U_{ex} and compute the resonance condition as a function of the gate voltage φ_G coupling to the island charge. Naturally, such a set-up might be difficult to realize experimentally. Nevertheless, the calculations for this model show how one can observe charging effects in principle. The great merit of such a set-up is that thermodynamic calculations suffice to determine the location of the resonances.²³ Since the large barriers confine the charge on the island to some integer value n , the resonance condition at $T = 0$ is simply $E(n) = E(n - 1)$, where $E(n)$ is the energy of the total system with charge ne on the island.

We start from $H = H_0 + H_I + H_S + H_G$, where H_S describes the impurities and H_G the coupling to the gate voltage φ_G ,

$$H_G = e\varphi_G [\theta(d/2) - \theta(-d/2)]/\sqrt{\pi}.$$

Since the gate voltage couples to the island charge capacitively, there is no need to resort to a boundary condition and one can use the standard term H_G . Furthermore, we assume that the impurities are strong enough to pin the plasmon displacement fields to the minima of the cosine, such that the fields $Q(\tau)$ and $N(\tau)$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= [\theta(d/2) + \theta(-d/2)]/\sqrt{\pi} \\ N &= [\theta(d/2) - \theta(-d/2)]/\sqrt{\pi} \end{aligned}$$

become discrete. Neglecting the Friedel oscillation, the charge on the island is $n = k_F d + N$, while Q is associated with transport through the island.

Enforcing the definitions of Q and N by Lagrange multiplier fields, one can proceed as before. Inserting the solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation into the action and integrating out the Lagrange multipliers yields the effective action¹³

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{\pi^2}{2} \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \left(\frac{N(\omega)N(-\omega)}{F(0, \omega) - F(d, \omega)} + \frac{Q(\omega)Q(-\omega)}{F(0, \omega) + F(d, \omega)} \right) \\ &\quad + e\varphi_G \int d\tau N(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

The mode N is gapped while Q is ungapped and hence irrelevant with respect to charging effects. The low-frequency sector can therefore be described by an effective energy

$$E(N) = N^2/2A + e\varphi_G N,$$

where we have introduced the quantity $A = [F(0, 0) - F(d, 0)]/\pi^2$ whose explicit form is

$$\begin{aligned} A &= (v_F/\pi^2) \int dk [1 - \cos(kd)]/\omega_k^2 \\ &= \frac{g^2 d}{\pi v_F} + \frac{g^2}{\pi^3} \int dk [U_0 - U_k] \frac{1 - \cos[kd]}{\omega_k^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

The first part is the renormalized level spacing derived in Refs. 5,13, while the second part is an additional contribution due to the charging energy. The condition $E(N) = E(N - 1)$ then directly yields the spacing of subsequent values of φ_G where one has a resonance,

$$e\Delta\varphi_G = 1/A. \quad (4.2)$$

For interaction range $R \ll d$, the $\cos[kd]$ in Eq. (4.1) does not contribute, and one recovers the single-impurity capacitance C_{fr} defined in Eq. (3.2). Taking into account also the Friedel oscillation contribution C_{2k_F} , one has the resonance condition in a particularly simple form,

$$eg^2\Delta\varphi_G = \left[\frac{d}{\pi v_F} + \frac{2C}{e^2} \right]^{-1}. \quad (4.3)$$

Remarkably, the capacitance will decrease the spacing $\Delta\varphi_G$, and therefore $\Delta\varphi_G$ is *smaller* than predicted for the zero-range model.^{5,13} At first sight, this might appear counter-intuitive because charging effects supposedly increase the spacing.²³ However, since A is always diminished by repulsive interactions, see Eq. (4.1), interactions *per se* will always enhance the spacing $\Delta\varphi_G$. The factor g^2 in Eq. (4.3) tends to increase $\Delta\varphi_G$, while a finite capacitance C decreases the spacing again. In total, however, one is still left with an enhanced spacing compared to the resonant-tunneling value $e\Delta\varphi_G = \pi v_F/d$ of a non-interacting wire. As a simple example, we consider Eq. (4.3) for the exponential interaction potential (3.3) leading to the capacitance (3.4). In that case, Eq. (4.3) becomes with the dimensionless interaction strength $u = U_0/\pi v_F$

$$e\Delta\varphi_G = \frac{\pi v_F(1+u)}{d + Ru/\sqrt{1+u}}.$$

For a given interaction range R , increasing the interaction strength u will always lead to a larger spacing $e\Delta\varphi_G$ compared to the value $\pi v_F/d$ arising from the bare level spacing of the island. On the other hand, for given u , increasing R decreases $\Delta\varphi_G$ for the reasons discussed above.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have employed the boundary condition formalism to investigate charging effects in one-dimensional quantum wires. Here, charging effects have two distinct origins: (i) The finite range of the screened Coulomb interaction potential, and (ii) the long-ranged nature of the Friedel oscillation in a Luttinger liquid. The

full density profile around an impurity in the presence of external voltage sources can be computed using the bosonization method under appropriate boundary conditions. Using that result, one can infer the value of the capacitance of the impurity. While this capacitance and hence charging effects do not seem to have consequences for dc transport properties in the case of a single impurity, the condition for resonant tunneling through a double barrier is modified compared to previous estimates if charging is properly taken into account.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank W. Häusler and F. Kassubek for useful discussions.

-
- ¹ S. Tarucha, T. Honda, and T. Saku, Solid State Commun. **94**, 413 (1995).
² A. Yacoby, H.L. Stormer, N.S. Wingreen, L.N. Pfeiffer, K.W. Baldwin, and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4612 (1996).
³ D.L. Maslov and M. Stone, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R5539 (1995); V.V. Ponomarenko, *ibid.* **52**, R8666 (1995); I. Safi and H.J. Schulz, *ibid.*, R17 040 (1995).
⁴ R. Egger and H. Grabert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 538 (1996).
⁵ C.L. Kane and M.P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 15 233 (1992).
⁶ K.A. Matveev, D. Yue, and L.I. Glazman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3351 (1993).
⁷ P. Fendley, A.W.W. Ludwig, and H. Saleur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 3005 (1995).
⁸ *Single Charge Tunneling*, edited by H. Grabert and M. Devoret, NATO ASI, Ser. B, Vol. 294 (Plenum, New York, 1992).
⁹ A. Luther and I. Peschel, Phys. Rev. B **9**, 2911 (1975).
¹⁰ V.J. Emery, in *Highly conducting one-dimensional solids*, edited by J.T. Devreese (Plenum, New York, 1979).
¹¹ F.D.M. Haldane, J. Phys. C **14**, 2585 (1981).
¹² G. Cuniberti, M. Sassetti, and B. Kramer, J. Phys.: Condens. Matt. **8**, L21 (1996).
¹³ A. Furusaki and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 3827 (1993).
¹⁴ R. Egger and H. Grabert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3505 (1995).
¹⁵ D.L. Maslov, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R14 368 (1995); A. Furusaki and N. Nagaosa, *ibid.* **54**, R5239 (1996).
¹⁶ R. Landauer, IBM J. Res. Dev. **1**, 223 (1957); Philos. Mag. **21**, 863 (1970); Z. Phys. B **68**, 217 (1987).
¹⁷ This amounts to $\int d\omega \langle q(\omega) \rangle \partial_x F(x, \omega) / F(0, \omega) = 0$ which can be checked by noting that $\langle q(\omega \neq 0) \rangle = 0$ and $\partial_x F(x, 0) / F(0, 0) = 0$.
¹⁸ M. Steiner and W. Häusler, (preprint).
¹⁹ The pinning function of Ref. 14 is equal to unity for a strong scatterer. This holds for any repulsive Coulomb interaction potential.

- ²⁰ H.J. Schulz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1864 (1993); M. Fabrizio, A.O. Gogolin, and S. Scheidl, *ibid.* **72**, 2235 (1994); N. Nagaosa and A. Furusaki, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **63**, 413 (1994).
²¹ H. Maurey and T. Giamarchi, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 10 833 (1995).
²² M. Sassetti, F. Napoli, and U. Weiss, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 11 213 (1995).
²³ H. van Houten, C.W.J. Beenakker, and A.A.M. Staring, in Ref. 8.